

Remarks

Claims 1-7 and 10-17 are pending.

Claims 1-7 and 10-17 are rejected by the Examiner.

Claims 2 and 6 were objected to because of the depiction of IEEE standards (i.e., IEEE-1394 and 802.11b). These claims have been amended to use generic terminology and withdrawal of these objections is requested.

Claims 1-7 and 10-17 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Devine et al. (US Patent 6,397,242).

Devine teaches a Virtual Machine Monitor (VMM) residing on one computer. The computer may have multiple processors (col. 7, lines 18-19), but the VMM resides on the machine for which it is providing a VMM (Abstract). There is no movement of a device from one computer (the first computer) to a second computer (the host computer) for which the device provides an emulator of the first computer to be executed on the host computer. The VMM is designed to run on a given hardware platform upon which it resides (col. 10, lines 16-23).

As mentioned in the office action, there was no definition of the 'first computer' in the claims. As set out in the specification, page 4, the user loads the proper emulator on the home computer (host computer) from the computer used as work (the first computer). Applicants have amended claims 1, 11 and 15 to more clearly set out that the host computer and the first computer are different computers.

For example, claim 1 as amended requires, "*a connector, operable to allow the memory to be disconnected from the first computer and to connect the memory to a host computer different from the first computer.*" As discussed above, Devine does not disclose a second computer.

Claim 11 as amended requires, *“connecting the memory device to a host computer different from the first computer having an original operating system and a host processor...”* and claim 15 requires, *“selecting an emulated operating system from multiple emulated operating systems available on the emulation device wherein the emulated operating system is that of a first computer different from the host computer...”* Similar to claim 1, Devine teaches a VMM on the same computer.

It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 11 and 15 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Bhagwat et al. (US Patent 6,721,805).

The addition of Bhagwat to attempt to overcome the addition of a wireless connection merely underlines the lack of an external connection used in Devine. If the VMM in Devine were able to be moved from system to system, the addition of Bhagwat would be unnecessary. For the reasons discussed above, Devine does not teach the elements of the invention as claimed in claim 1, from which claim 6 depends. Bhagwat does not overcome this deficiency. It is therefore submitted that claim 6 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Braun et al. (US Patent 6,411,276). As discussed above, Devine does not teach all of the limitations of the invention as claimed in claim 1, and Braun does not overcome that deficiency. It is therefore submitted that claims 2 and 3 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Dobbstein (US Patent No. 5,881,269).


As discussed above, Devine does not teach all of the limitations of the invention as claimed in claim 1, and Braun does not overcome that deficiency. It is therefore submitted that claims 4 and 5 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all pending claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Julie L. Reed

Reg. No. 35,349

210 S.W. Morrison Street
Suite 400
Portland, Oregon 97204
503-222-3613